continuous roads, which are imperatively called for; and in the meantime active steps must be taken to improve the existing thoroughfares, and fit them for the increased traffic, and the sudden outpouring of large multitudes of persons, produced by the present railway system.

It should be remembered too, that the widening of thoroughfares involves the public health, as well as the saving of time and improvement in appearance. By letting in light and air we are assisting to lengthen life, and to increase the sum of human happiness.

"WE CAN BE USEFUL NO LONGER THAN WE ARE WELL."

ARCHITECTURE:

THE ART, THE SCIENCE, AND THE PROFESSION.*

IN seeking to elevate the ART of architecture, Mr. Kerr has entered upon a labour worthy all the enthusiasm he has displayed. To impart new life to the only branch of human ingenuity which remains an exception to this century in its intellectual advancement, was an undertaking demanding great judgment and accurate investigation of principles. It would be no crime to fail in such an endeavour. To most writers, faint glimpses of the truth at intervals are all that appear; few seek to remove the obscurity; but the merit of Mr. Kerr's attempt rests on better grounds than priority of effort. He has had an object which demands the attention of all who profess the art, and the Newleafe Discourses will, in a great degree, aid in producing it. Architecture, as an art, *is* little studied, and much misunderstood.

But, in the execution of his work, Mr. Kerr has left apparent the difficulty of the subject. The Discourses are marked by some inconsistencies, and by much that it is our duty to protest vigorously against. Admitting the want of consideration for *art*, we would say, that what Mr. Kerr defines as architecture, is but one of its departments, or means of exercise; and he is at pains to exclude so much from his acceptation, that some may be obliged to inquire what remains. To define the term architecture,—to explain the full scope of its comprehension, would be a task that we might lay before the oldest professor, with little prospect of accomplishment. "We do not," says the writer in the *Quarterly Review*, "pay due honour to architecture, if we consider her as the sister, and therefore the equal, of the mere imitative arts: she is their queen. We want a term to designate the intellectual rank of architecture, so closely connected with the imagination, that we can scarcely term it a science,—so entirely practical and subservient to our needs, that we can scarcely reckon it as one of the æsthetic arts. And yet the arts must all be coerced into the architect's service. Architecture, as a branch of human wisdom, constitutes a genus of its own. Sculpture and painting are entirely founded upon the imitation of nature; whereas the basis of architecture is utility—utility in every sense, from the lowest to the highest, whilst it is wholly conventional in outward arrangements and forms. Architecture may borrow many a principle from nature; but she consults nature for *lessons*, and not for *models*."

Mr. Cockerell is next quoted as to the use made of lessons from nature, in the spire of St. Bride's, and the domes of Santa Maria at Florence, and St. Peter's at Rome. Further, "In ornament, architecture must equally appeal to nature, to the graceful leaf, the binding tendril, the spreading herb and floweret bright; but the architect employs them all as elements, and in combination. Even as the living body assimilates to itself the food which gives it growth, and the air imparting health and vigour, and above all bears in its countenance the expression of the vivifying mind, so does architecture render all the material objects of which the building is composed, and all the knowledge requisite for their combination, and all their elegance and symmetry, subservient to her own dominion and empire. Hence the magnificent conception of Vitruvius—every branch of human knowledge is needed to constitute the perfect architect: literature, design, geometry, optics, arithmetic, history, philosophy, music, medicine, jurisprudence, astronomy. There may be somewhat of Platonic mysticism in these Vitruvian opinions. Still we always find them cleaving more or less to the great masters of the art. They are founded upon immutable truths."

Mr. Kerr rejects, one by one, the science and practice of construction, the preparing of plans and specifications, the superintendence of works, the grammar and practice of art in all ages, and much that goes to make up the sum of "architecture," and restricts the term to "the art of the beautiful in buildings." His question, therefore, he answers only in part;—but we will not now quarrel about words, and receive the definition for the limits of this article.—But in what conduces to the *art* we deem him to be equally mistaken. "Constructionism," "archæology and antiquity-rule," and "ecclesiologism" contain nothing which is necessarily opposed to art; they are materials out of which it takes its true and proper aids, and its highest excellence. They may become despots, but they are not less the matter of good government: even Scripture can be perverted, and the powers of intellect employed for the debasement of the human race. When Wilkins deciphered inscriptions, and Donaldson elucidated the plan of the Greek theatre; when the Camden Society systematized and improved our acquaintance with "examples," were they contributing to the knowledge of *architecture?* We say—yes! Mr. Kerr says—no!

It would not be unfair to ask the author of the "Discourses" to enter somewhat deeper into his explanation of the remedy for the present state of art. Mr. Heavyith'heel, indeed, does not badly state the question when he says, that styles have been always matters of slow growth. "Did Phidias copy the Parthenon from authorities?" *We* say, yes. The Grecian style, perhaps more than any other, progressed by minute stages. The old Hecatompedon was Grecian-Doric, and not in a great degree different from the temple which rose on its site. "Go to Nature," and *entirely* reject "authority," and architecture is at once reduced to a state in which it has never existed, but at the origin of building. "It is indisputably evident," says Reynolds, "that a great part of every man's life must be employed in collecting materials for the exercise of genius. Invention, strictly speaking, is little more than a new combination of those images which have been previously gathered and deposited in the memory; nothing can come of nothing; he who has laid up no materials can produce no combinations." The history of art in all ages is against the entire disallowance of "precedent." The *fact* of a style having been used may be "no authority at all;" but it is right that we should not forget who were the artists, and who the people, from whom the architecture of Greece came to life. And however we may condemn an adherence to precedent which allows no exercise of thought, we cannot think that this consideration even is not of some value. We cannot admit that "copyism," as it is called, or the use of precedent, was commenced at "the revival;" the adaptation of Grecian art by the Romans resembled in all important points that of Roman art by the Italians.

Indeed, the word "revival" is partly a misnomer; for it would not be difficult to shew that invention characterized the early Italian style in a high degree; whilst the earliest architecture of the Roman empire was in fact Grecian. But, under some difference of title, Mr. Kerr shews that the reverse of his first assertion came to pass. And he is not far from giving the whole object of architectural study, in saying, "that which the imagination produces, it produces by the combination of simples previously known." "Antiquity-rule," or precedent, archæology, and construction should, we can sadly admit, be greater aids to art than they at present are.

It matters not that there is little of real "art" in *ordinary* house building; that is not less the kind of material out of which art springs, just as the block of marble, roughly shaped for the statue, has no other connection with the *art* of the sculptor than as the means by which that art may, or may not, find language. In the strictness of the Newleafe definition, the compounding of colours, the setting of the palette, the manipulation of painting, and the repetition of the sketch and of matters of detail in the picture, would in no degree confer the title of artist on the operator; this would be given only, of the actual indispensible labour, to that small part which is invention or design. Yet these details are not less closely united to the *art* of painting than are those which are included in the profession of the architect. They make up the "calling in life," but they are equally inseparable from the *art*. Mere construction would not be "art," any more than the delineation of forms in the picture from the model; yet both are amongst those aids, more or less mechanical, without which there can be no "art."

Mr. Kerr admits, indeed, that "the art" of architecture, and the practice of construction may be followed by the same individual, but he wishes to shew that there is a line of demarcation, one side of which gives no right to the title of artist. He says, "what I complain of is this, that now-a-days the doctrine is vehemently urged that *Construction is Architecture.*"—"I make no complaint against him who is Architect and Constructor together. But I say that Architecture and Construction are two things, not one: and that there is no need for putting the one in antagonism against the other.

MR. HEAV. But surely the principles of Architecture include Construction?

MR. NEWL. The principles of Architecture are in part *based upon* the principles of Construction (properly so called); but Architecture has nothing whatever to do with what the Brick-people call construction;—the proportioning of lime and hair and sand; the dimensions and fall of drains; cesspools; bricks; the pargetting of chimney-flues; the mysteries of water-closets, and sinks, and dressers, and pipe casings; hay racks and mangers; straps, nuts, bolts, washers; air-traps, stink-traps; putty and whitelead; pumice-stone and knotting; the arcana of five-coat-work and four-coat-work and three-coat-work, and glazing, and flatting, and distemper, and white-wash; and dry-rot and rats; and bell-hanging; and paper-hanging; and the prices of everything which it can enter into the heart of builder to estimate or overcharge; with all this the Fine Art Architecture has *nothing whatever* to do,—it is *Building*, or at most *Surveying*. Architecture is Design of The Beautiful in Buildings. In considerable part (as I shall afterwards describe) this is influenced by the appearance resulting or derived from constructive propriety (properly so called); wherefore, an Architect must understand, so far as Architectural design requires, the principles of Construction; but the Construction itself, and especially that which is called Construction by the Brick-people—the Science of house-building, is not Architecture, any more than it is Music or Political Economy.

MR. HEAV. Then you disapprove of an Architect being able to superintend the execution of his own designs?

MR. NEWL. Now you use cant phrases against me;—the *execution* of his *designs*. Architecture has its province merely in *appearance;* the *architectural* design extends no farther: the constructive design and the design of convenience in arrangement of plan and so forth are not *architectural* matters, but matters of house-building. Now I disapprove, not of the Architect of the house being at the same time the contriver or designer of the arrangement and construction, but merely of his supposing that the construction and arrangement are *Architecture*—the Fine Art Architecture.

MR. HEAV. You would have one person to contrive the plan; and another to design the front?

MR. NEWL. The *front?* The entire *appearance*, external and internal, is the matter of Architecture. But I have not said that I would have the Architect and the contriver or planner of the house to be different persons. I have merely said that in the one and the other he is in two capacities, not one; in the former an Artist, in the latter not so: and that, consequently, he who employs himself in the latter alone is not an Architect, because Architecture is a Fine Art."

"The Fine Art Architecture, said I, and the 'business' of an 'Architect' are very different things. So they are. The 'business' of an 'Architect' happens to be this;

* "The Newleafe Discourses on the Fine Art Architecture," by Robert Kerr, architect. Second Notice.

For info on PDF Compression and OCR go to our website